

REMARKS:

This application has been carefully studied and amended in view of the Office Action dated July 2, 2003. Reconsideration of that action is requested in view of the following.

Non-elected claims 1-10 have been canceled.

Parent claims 11 and 19 have been canceled. Claim 21 has been added as a new parent claim. Claims 22-23 have also been added to complete the claim coverage. Claim 12 has been amended to avoid the use of the word "or". Various dependent claims have been amended to be dependent on newly added claim 21. These amendments include amending the claimed dependency of claims 18 and 20 which had been objected to.

Reconsideration is respectfully requested of the rejection of claim 20 as not supported by the disclosure. In that regard, attention is directed to page 5, lines 3-7 of the application which points out that the liner provides 85 or more percent of the bursting pressure. This is support for the terminology in claim 20 with regard to "most of the pressure resistance". Newly added claim 23 is similar to claim 20 but uses language closer to the specific language of the specification.

Reconsideration is respectfully requested of the rejection of various claims as anticipated by AAPA or obvious over AAPA in view of Hext and further in view of Kipling. The Admitted Prior Art (AAPA) had been interpreted by Examiner Kenny as fully disclosing what had been in prior claim 11 which includes the feature of using a pre-existing, pre-formed pressurized-gas cylinder as the liner for a

composite cylinder. Such interpretation of the specification is not understood. Page 2, lines 1-17 simply refer to prior practices wherein pressurized-gas containers had been used and wherein containers had been made of a liner wrapped with composite fibers. Nowhere on page 2, lines 1-17 is there any mention that a pre-existing gas cylinder could be used as the liner. It is emphasized that the claims are directed to a process and that one of the process steps is the utilization of a pre-existing gas cylinder as the liner for a composite gas cylinder. This is not the same as taking a liner intended specifically to be part of a finished composite cylinder by wrapping composite fibers around the liner. Such practice is admittedly old, but in such practice the liner itself was not intended to be previously used per se as a gas cylinder.

A key feature of the present invention is thus the taking of a finished product which in itself has utility as a pressurized gas cylinder and then instead of discarding such cylinder such as after it had already been used the cylinder is modified to become a liner for a different composite gas cylinder, one which would be used for higher filling pressure than the pre-existing cylinder would have been used. The advantages of this process are significant in that it permits prior gas cylinders intended for lower filling pressures to be reused rather than being scrapped or thrown out. This results in saving resources and reduces emissions since fewer gas cylinders would have to be produced. In that regard, a gas cylinder previously made for use with certain filling pressures could then have a new life by functioning as a liner used for higher filling pressures in a composite gas cylinder where the pre-existing cylinder becomes the

liner by wrapping composite fibers over a substantial length of the pre-existing cylinder. These features are clearly not described as admitted prior art. This is not surprising because these are novel features which are also unobvious as confirmed by the lack of prior art disclosing the features in the face of the great benefits derived therefrom.

The Hext patent relates to pump cylinder liners. At the outset it is questioned whether it is reasonable to conclude that one of ordinary skill in the art in making a composite gas cylinder would look to pump cylinders. In any event, Hext is pertinent only to the extent that it relates to remanufacturing a product which initially was a liner and then by remanufacturing is still a liner but one of larger diameter. This has nothing to do with using a pre-existing cylinder, one which had a prior life of its own functioning as a gas cylinder and then taking that cylinder and converting it to a liner.

Kipling similarly discloses remanufacturing external cylinders to accommodate a new larger liner. Again, however, Kipling is devoid of any suggestion that a pre-existing member which could independently function as a gas cylinder could then later be used as part of a composite gas cylinder wherein the pre-existing cylinder is the liner for the composite gas cylinder by wrapping composite fibers over a substantial length of the pre-existing cylinder.

In view of the above remarks and amendments this application should be passed to issue.

Respectfully Submitted,
CONNOLLY BOVE LODGE & HUTZ, LLP
BY: Harold Pezzner
HAROLD PEZZNER

REG. NO. 22,112
1008 N. ORANGE STREET
P. O. BOX 2207
WILMINGTON, DE 19899
(302) 658-9141

::ODMA\MHODMA\CB;289520;1